

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 26 2005

From: Chris Rode
Applicant, PRO-SE
Application 09/287,478
To: Thai Phan, AU 2128
Date: 10/26/2005

Dear Mr. Phan,

Attached please find a summary of additional arguments distinguishing the present invention from Lawman (6,324,672).

Best regards,
Chris Rode

Additional response to Office communication regarding 09/287,478,
mailed 9/26/2005

Applicant would like to summarize additional differences between the present application and Lawman (672):

In addition to the discussed disadvantages of Lawman, a) traditional client-server socket-based communication leading to proxy incompatibility, b) requirements for traditional accounts including login, 3) dependency on Java for a UI, there are these additional differences:

1) Lawman does not teach simulation and in particular simulation that results in graphical output. Lawman teaches a pure form input used to create a client-side design database, which is subsequently transmitted to a Xilinx server for netlist and symbol generation and optional layout generation, any and all of which are then returned to the user. Lawman does claim a "third aspect" to his invention that allows data read from a remote IC to be stored in a simulation format, but this cannot imply simulation as there is no interface taught to control it, unlike with the present invention.

2) Lawman makes clear that the form interface is specifically not tied to any schematic (Abstract)

3) Lawman does teach the retrieval of a synthesized netlist, but not in a form suitable for immediate remote simulation, and in particular not for simulation by means of a synthetic Unique Identifier that can structure use of that server resource.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Rode
Rode Consulting, Inc.
781-899-4322